



NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF
MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES

Extensions of the Khinchine-Wisser Theorem

HAROLD N. SHAPIRO

PREPARED UNDER
CONTRACT NO. Nonr-285(38)
WITH THE
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH
UNITED STATES NAVY

REPRODUCTION IN WHOLE OR IN PART
IS PERMITTED FOR ANY PURPOSE
OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.

IMM-253
C1

EXTENSIONS OF THE KHINCHINE-WISSER THEOREM

Harold N. Shapiro

This report represents results obtained at the Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University, under the sponsorship of Contract No. Nonr-285(38), with the Office of Naval Research.

Extensions of the Khinchine - Wisser Theorem

§1. Introduction:

As an outgrowth of considerations related to the "Poincaré recurrence theorem" Khinchine proved:

If $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n, \dots$ is a given infinite sequence of measurable sets such that

$$(1.1) \quad P(A_n) \geq \alpha > 0, \quad \text{for all } n;$$

and the sequence is "stationary" , i.e.

$$(1.2) \quad P(A_r \cap A_s) = P(A_i \cap A_j), \quad \text{for } r-s = i-j;$$

then given any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an infinite subsequence A_{i_k} , $k = 1, 2, \dots$, such that

$$(1.3) \quad P(A_{i_k} \cap A_{i_\ell}) > (1-\epsilon)\alpha^2. \quad *$$

Wisser provided a much simplified proof of this, and at the same time dropped the assumption of stationarity. In this note various extensions of Wisser's result are obtained,

* Note that the theorem is trivially true for $\epsilon \geq 1$. Furthermore by choosing the A_n as independent sets such that $P(A_n) \rightarrow \alpha$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we see that the assertion (1.3) is in a sense best possible.

which focus on providing subsequences, of given infinite sequences, on which the probability of any finite intersection is bounded from below in a "natural way" .

§2. Notations.

In order to facilitate the statements and proofs which are to be presented it is convenient to utilize various notations, which are listed below.

For \mathcal{A} any sequence of sets A_1, A_2, \dots , (possibly a finite sequence), we set

$$(a) \underline{\mathcal{A}}(n) = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}, \text{ for each integer } n \geq 1;$$

and

$$(b) \bar{\mathcal{A}}(n) = \{A_{n+1}, \dots\}, \text{ for each integer } n \geq 1.$$

If \mathcal{T} is a subsequence of \mathcal{A} we write $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{A}$, or $\mathcal{A} \supset \mathcal{T}$; and in the special case where \mathcal{T} is a finite sequence we denote by $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{A}$ the sequence formed by first listing \mathcal{T} and then following it with \mathcal{A} . Thus, for example, for each integer $n \geq 1$

$$\mathcal{A} = \underline{\mathcal{A}}(n) \cup \bar{\mathcal{A}}(n);$$

$$\underline{\mathcal{A}}(n) \subset \mathcal{A}$$

and

$$\bar{\mathcal{A}}(n) \subset \mathcal{A}.$$

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...

...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...

...

...

...

...

In addition:

$$(c) \mathcal{S}^k = \left\{ A_{i_1} \cap A_{i_2} \cap \dots \cap A_{i_k} ; A_{i_\mu} \in \mathcal{S}, i_\mu \neq i_\nu \text{ for } \mu \neq \nu \right\},$$

for each integer $k \geq 1$. Note then that $\mathcal{S}^1 = \mathcal{S}$.

(d) $[\mathcal{S}]$ = the collection of all sets which occur in some \mathcal{S}^k , $k \geq 1$.

(e) For a set $B \in [\mathcal{S}]$ define $k = \rho(B)$ to be the smallest integer $k \geq 1$ such that $B \in \mathcal{S}^k$.

(f) \mathcal{S} is called " (n, β) linked" if for every pair of sets A, B such that $B \in \underline{\mathcal{S}}(n)$, $A \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}(n)$, we have $P(B) > 0$, and

$$P_B(A) \geq \beta P(A),$$

where $P_B(A)$ denotes the conditional probability of A , assuming B has occurred.

(g) \mathcal{S} is called "completely β linked" if it is (n, β) linked for every integer $n \geq 1$.

$$(h) \text{ Define } \triangle(\mathcal{S}) = \text{g.l.b. } P(A) \\ A \in \mathcal{S}$$

1900/1901

1. The first part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the function $f(x)$ defined by the equation

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n!} x^n$$

where a_n are arbitrary real numbers. It is shown that the function $f(x)$ is entire and that its growth is determined by the sequence $\{a_n\}$.

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n!} x^n$$

2. In the second part of the paper, we consider the case when the sequence $\{a_n\}$ is bounded. It is shown that in this case the function $f(x)$ is bounded in any sector of the complex plane.

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n!} x^n$$

3. In the third part of the paper, we consider the case when the sequence $\{a_n\}$ is unbounded. It is shown that in this case the function $f(x)$ is unbounded in any sector of the complex plane.

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n!} x^n$$

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n!} x^n$$

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n!} x^n$$

4. In the fourth part of the paper, we consider the case when the sequence $\{a_n\}$ is not bounded and not unbounded. It is shown that in this case the function $f(x)$ is bounded in any sector of the complex plane.

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n!} x^n$$

5. In the fifth part of the paper, we consider the case when the sequence $\{a_n\}$ is not bounded and not unbounded. It is shown that in this case the function $f(x)$ is unbounded in any sector of the complex plane.

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n!} x^n$$

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n!} x^n$$

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n!} x^n$$

§3. A generalization of the Khinchine - Wisser Theorem. In terms of the notation provided in the previous section one possible extension of the Khinchine - Wisser Theorem may be given as follows:

Theorem 3.1 Given an infinite sequence \mathcal{S} such that $\Delta(\mathcal{S}) > 0$,* and any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a subsequence $\mathcal{S}' \subset \mathcal{S}$, such that \mathcal{S}' is completely $(1-\epsilon)$ linked.

Remark: It is clear that one need only consider the case where $\epsilon < 1$.

The theorem given above is obtained by means of an inductive construction, whose relation to the theorem is provided in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1 Given an infinite sequence of subsequences of \mathcal{S} ,

$$\mathcal{S} \supset \mathcal{S}'_1 \supset \mathcal{S}'_2 \supset \dots \supset \mathcal{S}'_n \supset \mathcal{S}'_{n+1} \supset \dots$$

such that

(3.1) \mathcal{S}'_n is (n, λ_n) linked, $\lambda_n > 1-\epsilon$;

(3.2) $\mathcal{S}'_n(n) \subset \mathcal{S}'_{n+1}(n+1)$,

for all $n \geq 1$; define

(3.3) $\mathcal{S}' = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{S}'_n(n)$.

* The condition $\Delta(\mathcal{S}) > 0$ can be weakened to $\liminf P(A_n) > 0$.

The first of these is the fact that the
of the system is not in the same position as the
of the system is not in the same position as the

of the system is not in the same position as the
of the system is not in the same position as the
of the system is not in the same position as the
of the system is not in the same position as the

of the system is not in the same position as the
of the system is not in the same position as the
of the system is not in the same position as the
of the system is not in the same position as the

of the system is not in the same position as the

of the system is not in the same position as the
of the system is not in the same position as the
of the system is not in the same position as the
of the system is not in the same position as the

of the system is not in the same position as the
of the system is not in the same position as the
of the system is not in the same position as the
of the system is not in the same position as the

Then, the sequence \mathcal{J}' is completely $1-\epsilon$ linked.

Proof: Suppose that $B \in [\mathcal{J}'(n)]$, $A \in \mathcal{J}'(n)$. Then $B \in [\mathcal{J}'_n(n)]$ and $A \in \mathcal{J}_n(n)$. Then, since \mathcal{J}'_n is (n, λ_n) linked, $P(B) > 0$, and

$$P_B(A) \geq \lambda_n P(A) > (1-\epsilon) P(A).$$

Hence, \mathcal{J}' is $(n, 1-\epsilon)$ linked for every $n \geq 1$, and consequently completely $(1-\epsilon)$ linked.

Thus in order to prove Theorem 3.1 we need only construct the sequence of subsequences described in Lemma 3.1. This construction will in turn be made to depend on the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. Given an infinite sequence $\mathcal{J} = (A_1, A_2, \dots)$ such that $\Delta(\mathcal{J}) > 0$, and a set B such that $P(B) > 0$ and

$$(3.4) \quad P_B(A_n) \geq (1-\lambda) P(A_n),$$

for all $n \geq 1$; for any $\eta > 0$ (however small) there exists an infinite subsequence $\mathcal{J}' = (A_{i_1}, \dots) \subset \mathcal{J}$ such that

$$(3.5) \quad P_{BA_{i_1}}(A_{i_\mu}) \geq (1-\lambda-\eta) P(A_{i_\mu}),$$

for all $\mu \geq 1$.

Proof: Note first that for $\mu = 1$, (3.5) holds automatically, so that once the subsequence \mathcal{J} is constructed we need only focus on the verification of (3.5) for $\mu \geq 2$.

Negating the assertion of the lemma provides that for each $A_{i_1} \in \mathcal{J}$,

$$P_{BA_{i_1}}(A_j) < (1-\lambda-\eta) P(A_j)$$

for all $j > i$, except for a finite number of exceptions.

This in turn allows us to construct an infinite subsequence \mathcal{J}'' of \mathcal{J} , $\mathcal{J}'' = \{A_{j_1}, A_{j_2}, \dots\}$, such that

$$(3.6) \quad P_{BA_{j_\sigma}}(A_{j_\tau}) < (1-\lambda-\eta) P(A_{j_\tau}),$$

for all pairs (σ, τ) with $\sigma < \tau$.

Letting $\chi(\omega/A)$ denote the characteristic function of the set A , we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2} dx = 1 \quad (1)$$

or

Let us consider the function $f(x) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2}$ and its Fourier transform $F(\omega)$. We have $f(x) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2}$ and $F(\omega) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2} e^{-i\omega x} dx$. We can use the Gaussian integral formula to evaluate $F(\omega)$.

Let us consider the function $f(x) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2}$ and its Fourier transform $F(\omega)$.

$$F(\omega) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2} e^{-i\omega x} dx$$

$$F(\omega) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2} e^{-i\omega x} dx$$

Let us consider the function $f(x) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2}$ and its Fourier transform $F(\omega)$. We have $f(x) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2}$ and $F(\omega) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2} e^{-i\omega x} dx$. We can use the Gaussian integral formula to evaluate $F(\omega)$.

$$F(\omega) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2} e^{-i\omega x} dx$$

$$F(\omega) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2} e^{-i\omega x} dx \quad (2)$$

Let us consider the function $f(x) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2}$ and its Fourier transform $F(\omega)$.

Let us consider the function $f(x) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2}$ and its Fourier transform $F(\omega)$.

$$F(\omega) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2} e^{-i\omega x} dx$$

$$0 \leq \int_B \left(\sum_{\sigma=1}^n \chi(\omega | BA_{j_\sigma}) - \frac{1}{P(B)} \sum_{\sigma=1}^n P(BA_{j_\sigma}) \right)^2 dP(\omega),$$

$$(3.7) \quad \overline{\sum_{\substack{\sigma=1, \dots, n \\ \tau=1, \dots, n}} P(BA_{j_\sigma} A_{j_\tau})} \geq \frac{1}{P(B)} \left\{ \sum_{\sigma=1}^n P(BA_{j_\sigma}) \right\}^2.$$

We next rewrite (3.7) in the form

$$(3.8) \quad \sum_{\sigma=1}^n P(BA_{j_\sigma}) \overline{\sum_{\sigma < \tau \leq n} P_{BA_{j_\sigma}}(A_{j_\tau})} \\ \geq \sum_{\sigma=1}^n P(BA_{j_\sigma}) \overline{\sum_{\sigma < \tau \leq n} P_B(A_{j_\tau})} + o(n).$$

Using (3.4) on the right of (3.8), we get

$$(3.9) \quad \sum_{\sigma=1}^n P(BA_{j_\sigma}) \overline{\sum_{\sigma < \tau \leq n} P_{BA_{j_\sigma}}(A_{j_\tau})} \\ \geq (1-\lambda) \sum_{\sigma=1}^n \overline{\sum_{\sigma < \tau \leq n} P(BA_{j_\sigma}) P(A_{j_\tau})} + o(n).$$

Using (3.6) on the left of (3.9) this yields in turn

$$(3.10) \quad 1-\lambda-\eta \geq 1-\lambda + o \left(n / \overline{\sum_{\substack{\sigma, \tau \leq n \\ \sigma < \tau}} P(BA_{j_\sigma}) P(A_{j_\tau})} \right).$$

However, since by (3.4) and the definition of $\Delta(\mathcal{F}) > 0$,

$$\overline{\sum_{\substack{\sigma, \tau \leq n \\ \sigma < \tau}} P(BA_{j_\sigma}) P(A_{j_\tau})} \geq (1-\lambda) \Delta^2(\mathcal{F}) \frac{n(n-1)}{2} P(B),$$

we see that by taking n sufficiently large (3.10) implies $\eta \leq 0$, which is a contradiction. The lemma then follows.

Proof of Theorem 3.1

By applying the Lemma 3.2 we now proceed to the construction of the subsequences \mathcal{J}'_n described in Lemma 3.1. We begin by applying Lemma 3.2 with

$$\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J},$$

$$B = \text{the whole space},$$

$$\lambda = 0,$$

$$\epsilon = \epsilon/2.$$

The subsequence \mathcal{J}' provided by Lemma 3.2 is then taken as \mathcal{J}'_1 , and by (3.5) this is clearly $(1, \lambda_1)$ linked with $\lambda_1 = 1 - \epsilon/2$.

Now assume that $\mathcal{J} \supset \mathcal{J}'_1 \supset \mathcal{J}'_2 \supset \dots \supset \mathcal{J}'_n$, ($n > 1$), have been constructed so as to satisfy (3.1) and (3.2), with $\lambda_k = 1 - \epsilon \sum_{i=1}^k 1/2^i$. Consider, then, a $B \in [\mathcal{J}'_n(n)]$. Since \mathcal{J}'_n is (n, λ_n) linked, $P(B) > 0$, and for any $A \in \mathcal{J}'_n(n)$ we have

$$P_B(A) \geq \lambda_n P(A).$$

Thus $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}'_n(n)$ satisfies (3.4) with $\lambda = 1 - \lambda_n$, and

$\Delta(\mathcal{J}'_n(n)) \geq \Delta(\mathcal{J}) > 0$, so that Lemma 3.2 may be applied

Let f be a function defined on a set S . Then f is said to be a function from S to T if for every $x \in S$, $f(x) \in T$.

Definition 1.1

Let f be a function from S to T . Then f is said to be injective if for every $x, y \in S$, $f(x) = f(y)$ implies $x = y$. f is said to be surjective if for every $t \in T$, there exists $s \in S$ such that $f(s) = t$. f is said to be bijective if it is both injective and surjective.

$$f: S \rightarrow T$$

Let f be a function from S to T .

$$f(x) = y$$

$$f^{-1}(y) = \{x \in S : f(x) = y\}$$

Let f be a function from S to T . Then f is said to be invertible if there exists a function g from T to S such that $g(f(x)) = x$ for every $x \in S$ and $f(g(y)) = y$ for every $y \in T$. In this case, g is called the inverse of f , denoted by f^{-1} .

Let f be a function from S to T . Then f is said to be invertible if and only if f is bijective.

Let f be a function from S to T . Then f is said to be invertible if and only if f is bijective.

Let f be a function from S to T . Then f is said to be invertible if and only if f is bijective.

Let f be a function from S to T . Then f is said to be invertible if and only if f is bijective.

$$f^{-1}(f(x)) = x$$

Let f be a function from S to T . Then f is said to be invertible if and only if f is bijective.

Let f be a function from S to T . Then f is said to be invertible if and only if f is bijective.

with $\epsilon = \epsilon/2^{n+1}$. This provides a subsequence $\mathcal{T}'_1 \subset \mathcal{J}'_n(n)$, on which (3.5) holds. Proceeding next with another B in $[\mathcal{J}'_n(n)]$ we extract a subsequence $\mathcal{T}'_2 \subset \mathcal{T}'_1$ such that (3.5) holds, this time with the new B . Repeating this process until the finite number of B in $[\mathcal{J}'_n(n)]$ are all accounted for, we arrive at a \mathcal{T}'_m which is an infinite subsequence of $\mathcal{J}'_n(n)$, having the property that for all $B \in [\mathcal{J}'_n(n)]$, and any $A_{i_\mu} \in \mathcal{T}'_m$, $\mu \geq 1$,

$$(3.11) \quad P_{BA_{i_1}}(A_{i_\mu}) \geq (1 - \epsilon \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} 1/2^i) P(A_{i_\mu}).$$

We then define the infinite sequence \mathcal{J}'_{n+1} by

$$(3.12) \quad \mathcal{J}'_{n+1} = \left\{ \mathcal{J}'_n(n), \mathcal{T}'_m \right\}.$$

Clearly, (3.2) holds, and (3.11) together with the facts that \mathcal{J}'_n is (n, λ_n) linked, and $\mathcal{T}'_m \subset \mathcal{J}'_n(n)$, implies that \mathcal{J}'_{n+1} is

$(n+1, \lambda_{n+1})$ linked, (where $\lambda_{n+1} = 1 - \epsilon \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} 1/2^i$). Thus we see that $\mathcal{J}'_{n+1} \subset \mathcal{J}'_n$ and satisfies the requirements of (3.1) and (3.2). The inductive character of the construction of the \mathcal{J}'_n

has been established, and Theorem 3.1 is proved.

Let $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of real numbers such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = L$.

Then for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a positive integer N such that for all $n > N$, $|x_n - L| < \epsilon$.

Using this definition, we can prove that the limit of a constant sequence is the constant itself.

Let $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of real numbers such that $x_n = c$ for all n .

Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = c$.

Proof: Let $\epsilon > 0$. We need to find N such that for all $n > N$, $|x_n - c| < \epsilon$.

$$|x_n - c| = |c - c| = 0 < \epsilon$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^2} = 0 \quad (1.1.2)$$

Let $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of real numbers such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = L$.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^2} = 0 \quad (1.1.3)$$

Let $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of real numbers such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = L$.

Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} = 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^2} = 0$.

Let $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of real numbers such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = L$.

Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} = 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^2} = 0$.

Let $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of real numbers such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = L$.

Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} = 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^2} = 0$.

Theorem 3.2 Given an infinite sequence \mathcal{S} such that

$\Delta(\mathcal{S}) > 0$, and any ϵ , $0 > \epsilon > 1$, there exists a subsequence $\mathcal{S}' \subset \mathcal{S}$, such that for any $E_i \in \mathcal{S}'$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, (any) $k \geq 1$)

$$(3.13) \quad P\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^k E_i\right) \geq (1-\epsilon)^{k-1} \prod_{i=1}^k P(E_i)$$

Proof: The subsequence \mathcal{S}' is taken here to be the one provided by Theorem 3.1. We further assume that the E_i are listed here in order of this occurrence in the sequence \mathcal{S}' ; and set

$$B_j = \bigcap_{i=1}^j E_i, \quad j = 1, \dots, k-1.$$

then

$$(3.14) \quad P\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^k E_i\right) = P(E_1) \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} P_{B_j}(E_{j+1});$$

and since \mathcal{S}' is completely $(1-\epsilon)$ linked

$$(3.15) \quad P_{B_j}(E_{j+1}) \geq (1-\epsilon) P(E_{j+1}), \quad j = 1, \dots, k-1.$$

(3.13) is then an immediate consequence of (3.14) and (3.15).

Corollary. The subsequence \mathcal{S}' produced in Theorem 3.2 has the property that for any $E \in [\mathcal{S}']$,

Let $f(x)$ be a function defined on the interval $[a, b]$.

Suppose that $f(x)$ is continuous on $[a, b]$ and that $f(a) = f(b)$. Then, by the Intermediate Value Theorem, there exists a point c in the interval (a, b) such that $f(c) = f(a)$.

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{x} \quad \text{on the interval } [1, 2]$$

Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{x}$ on the interval $[1, 2]$. Then $f(1) = 1$ and $f(2) = \frac{1}{2}$. Since $f(x)$ is continuous on $[1, 2]$ and $f(1) \neq f(2)$, the Intermediate Value Theorem does not apply.

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{x} \quad \text{on the interval } [1, 2]$$

Let

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{x} \quad \text{on the interval } [1, 2]$$

Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{x}$ on the interval $[1, 2]$. Then $f(1) = 1$ and $f(2) = \frac{1}{2}$.

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{x} \quad \text{on the interval } [1, 2]$$

Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{x}$ on the interval $[1, 2]$. Then $f(1) = 1$ and $f(2) = \frac{1}{2}$.

Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{x}$ on the interval $[1, 2]$. Then $f(1) = 1$ and $f(2) = \frac{1}{2}$.

Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{x}$ on the interval $[1, 2]$. Then $f(1) = 1$ and $f(2) = \frac{1}{2}$.

$$(3.16) \quad P(E) \geq \left\{ (1-\epsilon) \Delta(\mathcal{E}) \right\}^{\rho(E)}.$$

Proof: This is immediate from (3.13) and the fact that $\Delta(\mathcal{E}') \geq \Delta(\mathcal{E})$.

The above corollary is in form most closely related to the Khinchine - Wierman theorem, which only requires condition (3.16) for the case when $\rho(E) = 2$.

3a. A counterexample. At first glance, the above results suggest the possibility of something like (3.13) without the full hypothesis $\Delta(\mathcal{E}) > 0$. In particular, it is natural to attempt to replace the hypothesis $\Delta(\mathcal{E}) > 0$ by $\sum P(A_1) = \infty$, where the A_1 are the sets of the sequence \mathcal{E} . The following simple counterexample shows that this is not possible.

Let B_1, B_2, \dots be any infinite sequence of mutually disjoint sets such that $P(B_1) > 0$, for all i . We then form the sequence \mathcal{E} by first repeating B_1 , n_1 times, followed by B_2 repeated n_2 times, etc. We then have

$$\sum_{\mathcal{E}} P(A_1) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} n_i P(B_i),$$

which diverges, and as rapidly as we like, by an appropriate choice of the n_i . Furthermore, it is clear that (3.13) does not hold on any infinite subsequence of \mathcal{E} , for any $k > 1$.

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) = 1$$

Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^2 + \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}$ and $g(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^2 - \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}$.

$$f(x) + g(x) = x^2 + 1$$

Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^2 + \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}$ and $g(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^2 - \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}$.

Then $f(x) + g(x) = x^2 + 1$ and $f(x) - g(x) = x$.

$$f(x) + g(x) = x^2 + 1$$

Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^2 + \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}$ and $g(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^2 - \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}$.

Then $f(x) + g(x) = x^2 + 1$ and $f(x) - g(x) = x$.

$$f(x) + g(x) = x^2 + 1$$

Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^2 + \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}$ and $g(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^2 - \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}$.

Then $f(x) + g(x) = x^2 + 1$ and $f(x) - g(x) = x$.

$$f(x) + g(x) = x^2 + 1$$

Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^2 + \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}$ and $g(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^2 - \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}$.

Then $f(x) + g(x) = x^2 + 1$ and $f(x) - g(x) = x$.

$$f(x) + g(x) = x^2 + 1$$

$$f(x) - g(x) = x$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) = 1$$

Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^2 + \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}$ and $g(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^2 - \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}$.

Then $f(x) + g(x) = x^2 + 1$ and $f(x) - g(x) = x$.

Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^2 + \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}$ and $g(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^2 - \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}$.

§4. Further generalizations of the Khinchine-Wisser Theorem

The generalization of the Khinchine-Wisser Theorem provided by Theorem 3.1 focuses on estimating certain conditional probabilities from below. However, as we've seen, the estimate (3.13) given in Theorem 3.2 is, in form, more closely related to the original results of Khinchine and Wisser. In considering the question of possible refinements of this estimate, it is only natural to ask whether or not the subsequence \mathcal{A}' can be chosen so that the dependence on k occurring in the factor $(1-\epsilon)^k$, in (3.13), is removed. The answer to this question is in the affirmative, and we formulate this formally as:

Theorem 4.1. Given an infinite sequence \mathcal{S} such that $\Delta(\mathcal{S}) > 0$, and any ϵ , $0 < \epsilon < 1$, there exists an infinite subsequence $\mathcal{S}' \subset \mathcal{S}$, such that for any $E_1 \in \mathcal{S}'$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, (any $k \geq 1$), we have

$$(4.1) \quad P\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^k E_i\right) \geq (1-\epsilon) \prod_{i=1}^k P(E_i) .$$

It is clear that, by the same derivation used to obtain Theorem 3.2 from Theorem 3.1, Theorem 4.1 would be an easy consequence of the following.

Theorem 4.2 Given an infinite sequence \mathcal{S} such that $\Delta(\mathcal{S}) > 0$, and any infinite sequence of real numbers ϵ_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots$, $0 < \epsilon_i < 1$, there exists an infinite subsequence $\mathcal{S}' \subset \mathcal{S}$ such that for

$$A_{i_1}, A_{i_2}, \dots, A_{i_{k-1}}, A_{i_k} \in \mathcal{S}'$$

(any $k \geq 1$), and any $A \in \mathcal{S}'$ which appears in the sequence after all the A_{i_μ} , $\mu = 1, \dots, k$, we have

$$(4.2) \quad P_{A_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap A_{i_k}}(A) \geq (1 - \epsilon_k)P(A).$$

We note that Theorem 3.1 is simply the special case of Theorem 4.2 in which all the $\epsilon_i = \epsilon$. The added strength of Theorem 4.2 lies in the fact that ϵ_i may be chosen so as to tend to zero as $i \rightarrow \infty$, and as rapidly as we please.

We shall in fact obtain the following slightly stronger assertion:

Theorem 4.2A. Given an infinite sequence \mathcal{S} such that $\Delta(\mathcal{S}) > 0$, and any function $\phi(u) > 0$, such that $\phi(u) \rightarrow 0$ as $u \rightarrow \infty$, there exists an infinite subsequence $\mathcal{S}' \subset \mathcal{S}$ such that for all

$$A_{i_1}, A_{i_2}, \dots, A_{i_{k-1}}, A_{i_k} \in \mathcal{S}',$$

(any $k \geq 1$), where the A_{i_μ} are listed in order of occurrence in \mathcal{S}' , we have

$$(4.2A) \quad P_{A_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap A_{i_{k-1}}}(A_k) \geq (1 - \phi(i_k))P(A_k).$$

Remarks.

(1) Theorem 4.2A provides a corresponding strengthening of Theorem 4.1 in which the assertion (4.1) is replaced by

$$(4.1A) \quad P\left(\bigcap_{\mu=1}^k A_{i_\mu}\right) \geq \prod_{\mu=2}^k (1 - \phi(i_\mu))P(A_{i_\mu})$$

(2) Theorem 4.2A is an immediate consequence of the apparently weaker statement which asserts that there exists some function $\phi_0(u) > 0$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \phi_0(u) = 0$, and a subsequence \mathcal{S}' such that (4.2A) holds, (with ϕ_0 for ϕ). This follows, since by a further extraction of a subsequence \mathcal{S}'' from \mathcal{S}' , it can be arranged that ϕ_0 goes to zero, as fast as we like, over the original \mathcal{S}' indices of the sets of \mathcal{S}'' . That is, if ϕ is given, $\mathcal{S}'' = (E_1, E_2, \dots)$, $E_\mu = A_{i_\mu}$ in \mathcal{S}' , we arrange that

THE HISTORY OF THE

REIGN OF KING CHARLES THE FIRST
IN THE YEAR 1649

BY JOHN BURNET

LONDON
Printed by J. Streater, at the Sign of the Gun, in St. Dunstons Church-yard, 1692

By Authority

Approved by the Senate of the University of Oxford
In the Year 1692

Printed by J. Streater, at the Sign of the Gun, in St. Dunstons Church-yard, 1692

$$d_0(i_\mu) \leq d(\mu).$$

The remainder of this section will be devoted to the proof of Theorem 4.2A. For this purpose, it is useful to introduce the function $\epsilon(B|\mathcal{G})$, defined for every measurable set B , by

$$(4.3) \quad \epsilon(B|\mathcal{G}) = \lim_{A \in \mathcal{G}} \left\{ 1 - \frac{P_B(A)}{P(A)} \right\}$$

This may also be written as

$$(4.4) \quad \overline{\lim}_{A \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{P_B(A)}{P(A)} = 1 - \epsilon(B|\mathcal{G}).$$

Lemma 4.1 Given an infinite sequence \mathcal{G} there exists an infinite subsequence $\mathcal{G}' \subset \mathcal{G}$ such that for all $B \in [\mathcal{G}']$, we have

$$(4.5) \quad \lim_{A \in \mathcal{G}'} \frac{P_B(A)}{P(A)} = 1 - \epsilon(B|\mathcal{G}').$$

Proof: Let A_1 be the first element of \mathcal{G} . Choose a subsequence $\mathcal{G}^{(11)}$ of \mathcal{G} such that

$$\lim_{A \in \mathcal{G}^{(11)}} \frac{P_{A_1}(A)}{P(A)} = 1 - \epsilon(A_1|\mathcal{G}^{(11)}).$$

Let A_2 be the first element of $\mathcal{G}^{(11)}$, (after A_1), and choose an infinite subsequence $\mathcal{G}^{(12)} \subset \mathcal{G}^{(11)}$ such that

$$\lim_{A \in \mathcal{J}} (12) \frac{P_{A_2}(A)}{P(A)} = 1 - \epsilon(A_2 | \mathcal{J}^{(12)}).$$

Note that we also automatically have

$$\lim_{A \in \mathcal{J}} (12) \frac{P_{A_1}(A)}{P(A)} = 1 - \epsilon(A_1 | \mathcal{J}^{(12)});$$

and in fact $\epsilon(A_1 | \mathcal{J}^{(11)}) = \epsilon(A_1 | \mathcal{J}^{(12)})$. Continuing with this process we produce an infinite sequence

$$\mathcal{J}^{<1>} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots\}$$

such that for any A_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots$

$$\lim_{A \in \mathcal{J}} <1> \frac{P_{A_i}(A)}{P(A)} = 1 - \epsilon(A_i | \mathcal{J}^{<1>}).$$

Next, we fix A_1, A_2 and extract an infinite subsequence

$\mathcal{J}^{(21)} \subset \mathcal{J}^{<1>}$, such that

$$\lim_{A \in \mathcal{J}} (21) \frac{P_{A_1 \cap A_2}(A)}{P(A)} = 1 - \epsilon(A_1 \cap A_2 | \mathcal{J}^{(21)}).$$

Let A_3 (this requires a convenient renaming of sets) be the first set of $\mathcal{J}^{(21)}$, (after A_1 or A_2), and choose a subsequence $\mathcal{J}^{(22)} \subset \mathcal{J}^{(21)}$ such that

$$\lim_{A \in \mathcal{A}} (21) \frac{P_{A_1 \cap A_2}^{(A)}}{P(A)} = 1 - \epsilon(A_1 \cap A_2 | \mathcal{A}^{(21)}).$$

Let A_3 (this requires a convenient renaming of sets) be the first set of $\mathcal{A}^{(21)}$, (after A_1 or A_2), and choose a subsequence $\mathcal{A}^{(22)} \subset \mathcal{A}^{(21)}$ such that

$$\lim_{A \in \mathcal{A}} (22) \frac{P_{A_1 \cap A_3}^{(A)}}{P(A)} = 1 - \epsilon(A_1 \cap A_3 | \mathcal{A}^{(22)}).$$

and

$$\lim_{A \in \mathcal{A}} (22) \frac{P_{A_2 \cap A_3}^{(A)}}{P(A)} = 1 - \epsilon(A_2 \cap A_3 | \mathcal{A}^{(22)}).$$

Clearly, we also have

$$\lim_{A \in \mathcal{A}} (22) \frac{P_{A_1 \cap A_2}^{(A)}}{P(A)} = 1 - \epsilon(A_1 \cap A_2 | \mathcal{A}^{(22)}).$$

Letting A_4 (again a renaming) be the first set in $\mathcal{A}^{(22)}$ (after A_1, A_2, A_3), and continuing this process we produce a subsequence $\mathcal{A}^{(2)} \subset \mathcal{A}^{(1)}$ such that

$$\lim_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \langle 2 \rangle \frac{P_B^{(A)}}{P(A)} = 1 - \epsilon(B | \mathcal{A}^{(2)})$$

for are $B \in [\mathcal{S}^{<2>}]$ such that $\rho(B) \leq 2$. We note further that $\mathcal{S}^{<2>}$ has retained the first two elements of $\mathcal{S}^{<1>}$. Continuing then analogously we can extract an infinite subsequence $\mathcal{S}^{<3>} \subset \mathcal{S}^{<2>}$ such that $\mathcal{S}^{<3>}$ retains the first three elements of $\mathcal{S}^{<2>}$ and such that

$$\lim_{A \in \mathcal{S}^{<3>}} \frac{P_B(A)}{P(A)} = 1 - \epsilon(B | \mathcal{S}^{<3>})$$

for all $B \in \mathcal{S}^{<3>}$ such that $\rho(B) \leq 3$. Continuing indirectly in this way we define $\mathcal{S}^{<k>}$ for all $k \geq 1$ with analogous properties, so that

$$\mathcal{S}' = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{S}^{<k>} (k)$$

satisfies (4.5), for all $B \in [\mathcal{S}']$.

We note that the sequence \mathcal{S}' produced by the above lemma has the property that for \mathcal{S}'' any infinite subsequence of \mathcal{S}' , and all $B \in [\mathcal{S}']$,

$$(4.6) \quad \epsilon(B | \mathcal{S}') = \epsilon(B, \mathcal{S}'')$$

and

$$(4.7) \quad \lim_{A \in \mathcal{S}''} \frac{P_B(A)}{P(A)} = 1 - \epsilon(B | \mathcal{S}'').$$

In other words, the characteristic properties which dictated the construction of \mathcal{S}' are inherited by every infinite

subsequence of \mathcal{S}' .

This observation leads to the following sharpening of Lemma 4.1.

Lemma 4.2. Let \mathcal{S} be a given infinite sequence of sets. For any sequence \mathcal{T} of sets, and any $A \in \mathcal{T}$, let $r(A|\mathcal{T})$ denote the order of occurrence of A in \mathcal{T} . There exists an infinite subsequence $\mathcal{S}' \subset \mathcal{S}$, such that for any $B \in [\mathcal{S}']$,

$$(4.8) \quad \frac{P_B(A)}{P(A)} = 1 - \epsilon(B|\mathcal{S}') + E(B,A|\mathcal{S}')$$

with

$$(4.9) \quad |E(B,A|\mathcal{S}')| \leq r(A|\mathcal{S}')^{-3}$$

for all are $A \in \mathcal{S}'$ such that $r(A|\mathcal{S}')$ is larger than the order of occurrence of any "factor" of B .

Proof: We begin by extracting from \mathcal{S} the infinite subsequence provided by Lemma 4.1, such that (4.5) holds, which we here denote by \mathcal{S}^* . From the remarks preceding this lemma we see that if \mathcal{T} is any infinite subsequence of \mathcal{S}^* , and $B \in [\mathcal{S}^*]$, $A \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$(4.10) \quad E(B,A,\mathcal{S}^*) = E(B,A,\mathcal{T}).$$

Thus since

$$r(A|\mathcal{J}) \leq r(A|\mathcal{J}^*)$$

we see from (4.10) that if (4.9) were to hold on \mathcal{J}^* it would also certainly hold on \mathcal{J} . More generally, if (4.9) holds on any infinite subsequence of \mathcal{J}^* , its validity is maintained under further extraction of subsequences. Using this fact, together with an inductive construction similar to the one used in proving Lemma 4.1, it is an easy matter to extract the desired subsequence \mathcal{J}' out of the subsequence \mathcal{J}^* .

From this point on, we shall adopt the following convention: Given any sequence \mathcal{J} , let \mathcal{J}^* be the subsequence of \mathcal{J} provided by Lemma 4.2. Then for any $B \in [\mathcal{J}^*]$ we write

$$(4.11) \quad \epsilon(B) = \epsilon(B|\mathcal{J}^*).$$

Thus $\epsilon(B)$ is defined invariantly with respect to all infinite subsequence of \mathcal{J}^* , which eliminates the necessity of carrying such sequences notationally in the function $\epsilon(B)$.

Lemma 4.3. Let \mathcal{J} be a given infinite sequence of sets such that $\Delta(\mathcal{J}) > 0$. Then there exists an infinite subsequence $\mathcal{J}' \subset \mathcal{J}^*$ such that for all $B \in [\mathcal{J}']$, and $B \neq \Omega$ (the whole space), either

(a) $\epsilon(BA) < 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{J}'$ which appear in \mathcal{J}' after all of the factors of B , or

(b) $\epsilon(BA) \geq 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{J}'$ which appear in \mathcal{J}' after all the factors of B .

Furthermore,

$$(4.12) \quad \overline{\lim_{A \in \mathcal{J}'}} \epsilon(A) < \infty,$$

and $\epsilon(A) > 0$

$$(4.13) \quad \lim_{A \in \mathcal{J}'} \epsilon(BA) \leq \epsilon(B), \quad \text{for all } B \in [\mathcal{J}'].$$

A $B \in [\mathcal{J}']$ such that (a) holds will be referred to as of "type ν "; and if (b) holds, of "type π ". The subsequence \mathcal{J}' will thus have the further property that if

$$B = B'B'', \quad B', B'' \in [\mathcal{J}'],$$

such that all factors of B'' follow all those of B' , in \mathcal{J}' ; and B' is of type ν , then B is of type ν . Thus, it follows that if $B \in [\mathcal{J}]$ is of type π , then for any decomposition $B = B'B''$ such as described above, B' must also be of type π .

Proof: (§) We begin by extracting the subsequence \mathcal{S}^* and further thinning it out if necessary so that (3.13) holds with $\epsilon = 1/2$ for all ≥ 1 . then, either

(a)₁ $\epsilon(A) < 0$ for infinitely many $A \in \mathcal{S}^*$

or

(b)₁ $\epsilon(A) \geq 0$ for all but a finite number of $A \in \mathcal{S}^*$.

If alternative (a)₁ holds, let $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}$ denote the infinite subsequence consisting of the $A \in \mathcal{S}^*$ such that $\epsilon(A) < 0$.

If alternative (b)₁ holds, let $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}$ denote the infinite subsequence of \mathcal{S}^* obtained by deleting the finite number of $A \in \mathcal{S}^*$ such that $\epsilon(A) < 0$. Thus, either

(a)₁ $\epsilon(A) < 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{S}^{(1)}$

or

(b)₁ $\epsilon(A) \geq 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{S}^{(1)}$.

Under alternative (b)₁ we next wish to show that

(§ For the convenience of a later argument we assume to begin with that (by a subsequence extraction) it is arranged once and for all that

$$\lim_{A \in \mathcal{S}} P(A) = \alpha > 0.$$

$$(4.14) \quad \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}(1)} \epsilon(A) < \infty.$$

To achieve this we consider the inequality derived in the proof of Lemma 3.2. If $\mathcal{A}^{(1)} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots\}$ this gives

$$(4.15) \quad \sum_{\substack{i, j \\ 1 \leq i \leq n \\ 1 \leq j \leq n}} P(A_i A_j) \geq \sum_{\substack{i, j \\ 1 \leq i \leq n \\ 1 \leq j \leq n}} P(A_i) P(A_j)$$

From the construction of $\mathcal{A}^{(1)}$ as a subsequence of \mathcal{A}^* , we have for $i > j$,

$$P(A_i A_j) = P(A_i) P(A_j) \left[(1 - \epsilon(A_j)) + O\left(\frac{1}{i^3}\right) \right]$$

so that (4.15) yields

$$\begin{aligned} O(n) + \sum_{\substack{n \geq i > j \geq 1 \\ i, j}} P(A_i) P(A_j) \left[(1 - \epsilon(A_j)) + O\left(\frac{1}{i^3}\right) \right] \\ \geq \sum_{\substack{i, j \\ n \geq i > j \geq 1}} P(A_i) P(A_j) . \end{aligned}$$

This in turn reduces to

$$\sum_{\substack{n \geq i > j \geq 1 \\ i, j}} \epsilon(A_j) P(A_i) P(A_j) \leq \sum_{\substack{i < n \\ j \leq n}} O\left(\frac{1}{i^3}\right) + O(n) = O(n).$$

Since $P(A_1) \geq \Delta = \Delta(\mathcal{S}) > 0$, this gives

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \epsilon(A_j)(n-j) \leq O(n).$$

Finally, since the $\epsilon(A_j) \geq 0$ for all j , we set

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n/2} \epsilon(A_j) = O(1),$$

which implies (4.12).*

Next, let A_1 denote the first set in $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}$. Then

either

(a)₂₁ $\epsilon(A_1 A) < 0$ for infinitely many $A \in \mathcal{S}^{(1)}$ which follow A_1 ;

or

(b)₂₁ $\epsilon(A_1 A) \geq 0$ for all but a finite number of $A \in \mathcal{S}^{(1)}$.

If alternative (a)₂₁ holds let $\mathcal{S}^{(21)}$ be the infinite subsequence of $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}$ composed of the infinitely many $A \in \mathcal{S}^{(1)}$ such that $\epsilon(A_1 A) < 0$, together with A_1 itself. If alternative (b)₂₁ holds, let $\mathcal{S}^{(21)}$ consist of A_1 together with those $A \in \mathcal{S}^{(1)}$ such that $\epsilon(A_1 A) \geq 0$. Thus, either

(a)₂₁: $\epsilon(A_1 A) < 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{S}^{(21)}$ which follow A_1 ;

or

(b)₂₁: $\epsilon(A_1 A) \geq 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{S}^{(21)}$ which follow A_1 .

Next we show that if $\mathcal{S}^{(21)}$ was formed under alternative (a)₁₁, then alternative (a)₂₁ must hold; or equivalently that alternative (b)₂₁ cannot hold. This is an immediate consequence of (4.13) in the case $p(B) = 1$, which may be proved as follows. Let $\mathcal{S}^{(21)} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots\}$; then

$$(4.16) \quad P(A_1) \sum_{\substack{1, j \\ \sqrt[3]{n} < i \leq n \\ \sqrt[3]{n} < j \leq n}} P(A_1 A_i A_j) \geq \sum_{\substack{1, j \\ \sqrt[3]{n} < i \leq n \\ \sqrt[3]{n} < j \leq n}} P(A_1 A_i) P(A_1 A_j).$$

Furthermore, our assumptions provide that for $j > 1$

$$(4.17) \quad P(A_1 A_i A_j) = P(A_j) P(A_1 A_i) \left[1 - \epsilon(A_1 A_i) + O\left(\frac{1}{j^3}\right) \right]$$

and for all $j > 1$

* For the convenience of a later argument, we discard the finite number of $A \in \mathcal{S}^*$ such that

$$\epsilon(A) \geq 1/2.$$

1945-1946

20

1947-1948

1949-1950

1951-1952

1953-1954

1955-1956

1957-1958

1959-1960

1961-1962

1963-1964

$$(4.18) \quad P(A_1 A_j) = P(A_1)P(A_j) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{j^3}\right) - \varepsilon(A_1) \right).$$

Inserting (4.18) properly into (4.16) yields

$$\begin{aligned} P(A_1) \sum_{\substack{i, j \\ 3\sqrt{n} < i < n \\ \sqrt{n} < j \leq n \\ i < j}} P(A_1 A_i A_j) \\ \geq P(A_1) \sum_{\substack{i, j \\ 3\sqrt{n} < i \leq n \\ 3\sqrt{n} < j \leq n \\ i < j}} P(A_1 A_i) P(A_j) \left\{ 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{j^3}\right) - \varepsilon(A_1) \right\} + O(n), \end{aligned}$$

or

$$(4.19) \quad \sum_{\substack{i, j \\ 3\sqrt{n} < i < j \leq n}} P(A_1 A_i A_j) \geq (1 - \varepsilon(A_1)) \sum_{\substack{i, j \\ 3\sqrt{n} < i < j \leq n}} P(A_1 A_i) P(A_j) + O(n).$$

But (4.19) implies the existence of a pair $i_0 = i_0(n)$,

$$j_0 = j_0(n)$$

such that

$$3\sqrt{n} < i_0 < j_0 \leq n,$$

and

$$(4.20) \quad P(A_1 A_{i_0} A_{j_0}) \geq (1 - \varepsilon(A_1)) P(A_1 A_{i_0}) P(A_{j_0}) + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$$

Combining (4.20) and (4.7), and using that $j_0^3 > n$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.21) \quad & P(A_{j_0})P(A_1 A_{i_0})(-\epsilon(A_1 A_{i_1})) \\
 & \geq -\epsilon(A_1)P(A_1 A_{i_0})P(A_{j_0}) + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Then since $P(A_1 A_{j_0})P(A_{j_0})$ is bounded away from zero uniformly in i_0, j_0 ; ^(§)

$$0 \geq -\epsilon(A_1 A_{i_1}) \geq -\epsilon(A_1) + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right),$$

This in particular, completes the proof of the fact that if alternative (a)₁ holds, alternative (a)₂₁ must hold.

Next let A_2 be the first set in $\mathcal{B}^{(21)}$ after A_1 .

Then, either

(a)₂₂: $\epsilon(A_2 A) < 0$ for infinitely many $A \in \mathcal{B}^{(21)}$

which follow A_2 ;

or

(b)₂₂: $\epsilon(A_2 A) \geq 0$ for all but a finite number of $A \in \mathcal{B}^{(21)}$.

(§) We have this because of our initial arrangement that (3.13) hold with $\epsilon = 1/2$.

If alternative $(a)_{22}$ holds, let $\mathcal{J}^{(22)}$ be the infinite subsequence of $\mathcal{J}^{(21)}$ composed of the infinitely many $A \in \mathcal{J}^{(1)}$ such that $\varepsilon(A_2 A) < 0$, together with A_1 and A_2 .

If alternative $(b)_{22}$ holds, let $\mathcal{J}^{(22)}$ consist of A_1, A_2 , together with those $A \in \mathcal{J}^{(21)}$, which follow A_2 , and are such that $\varepsilon(A_2 A) \geq 0$. Thus either

$(a)_{22}$: $\varepsilon(A_2 A) < 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{J}^{(22)}$ which follow A_2 ;

or

$(b)_{22}$: $\varepsilon(A_2 A) \geq 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{J}^{(22)}$ which follow A_2 .

By argument entirely analogous to the one given above for $\mathcal{J}^{(21)}$, it can be shown that (4.13) holds for $p(B) = 2$ and hence that alternative $(a)_{22}$ must occur if alternative $(a)_1$ occurred.

Repeating the above procedure inductively produces an infinite sequence of subsequences $\mathcal{J}^{(2,k)}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, such that

$$(i)_k \quad \mathcal{J}^{(2,(k+1))} \subset \mathcal{J}^{(2,k)}$$

$$(ii)_k \quad \mathcal{J}^{(2,k+1)}_{(k+1)} \supset \underline{\mathcal{J}^{(2,k)}_{(k)}}$$

$$(iii)_k \quad \text{for any } A_* \in \underline{\mathcal{J}^{(2,k)}_{(k)}}, \text{ either}$$

$(a)_{2,k}$: $\varepsilon(A_*A) < 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{S}^{(2,k)}$ which follow A_* ;

or

$(b)_{2,k}$: $\varepsilon(A_*A) \geq 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{S}^{(2,k)}$ which follow A_*

$(iv)_k$ the alternative $(a)_{2,k}$ holds if the alternative $(a)_1$ held originally.

We then see that the infinite sequence

$$(4.21) \quad \mathcal{S}^{(2)} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{S}^{(2,k)}(k)$$

is a subsequence of $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}$, such that

$$(4.22) \quad \mathcal{S}^{(1)}(1) \subseteq \mathcal{S}^{(2)}(2) ;$$

and for any $B \in [\mathcal{S}^{(2)}]$ such that $\rho(B) \leq 1$ either

$(a)_2$: $\varepsilon(BA) < 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{S}^{(2)}$ which follow all factors of B

or

$(b)_2$: $\varepsilon(BA) \geq 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{S}^{(2)}$ which follow all factors of B .

Furthermore, alternative $(a)_2$ holds if $(a)_1$ held originally.

Next we take the first two sets A_1, A_2 in $\mathcal{S}^{(2)}$ and for $B = A_1 \cap A_2$, we have that either

1

•

(a)₃₁₂: $\epsilon(BA) < 0$ for infinitely many $A \in \mathcal{A}^{(2)}$ which follow A_2 ;

or

(b)₃₁₂: $\epsilon(BA) \geq 0$ for all but a finite number of sets $A \in \mathcal{A}^{(2)}$.

If alternative (a)₃₁₂ holds, let $\mathcal{A}^{(312)}$ denote the infinite subsequence of $\mathcal{A}^{(2)}$ consisting of A_1 , A_2 , and those $A \in \mathcal{A}^{(2)}$ following A_2 , such that $\epsilon(BA) < 0$. If alternative (b)₃₁₂ holds, let $\mathcal{A}^{(312)}$ denote the infinite subsequence of $\mathcal{A}^{(2)}$ consisting of A_1 , A_2 , together with those $A \in \mathcal{A}^{(2)}$ following A_2 , such that $\epsilon(BA) \geq 0$. Thus, either

(a)₃₁₂: $\epsilon(BA) < 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}^{(312)}$ which follow A_2 ;

or

(b)₃₁₂: $\epsilon(BA) \geq 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}^{(312)}$ which follow A_2 .

then by exactly the same argument as used in treating the alternative (a)₂₁, (just replace the A_1 there by B), it follows that if (a)₂ held originally for $B = A_1$ alternative (a)₃₁₂ must hold.

Letting A_3 be the first set of $\mathcal{A}^{(312)}$ after A_2 , we process $B = A_1 \cap A_3$, and $B = A_2 \cap A_3$ successively to produce

[illegible]

6. 1950. 1951. 1952. 1953. 1954. 1955. 1956. 1957. 1958. 1959. 1960. 1961. 1962. 1963. 1964. 1965. 1966. 1967. 1968. 1969. 1970. 1971. 1972. 1973. 1974. 1975. 1976. 1977. 1978. 1979. 1980. 1981. 1982. 1983. 1984. 1985. 1986. 1987. 1988. 1989. 1990. 1991. 1992. 1993. 1994. 1995. 1996. 1997. 1998. 1999. 2000. 2001. 2002. 2003. 2004. 2005. 2006. 2007. 2008. 2009. 2010. 2011. 2012. 2013. 2014. 2015. 2016. 2017. 2018. 2019. 2020. 2021. 2022. 2023. 2024. 2025. 2026. 2027. 2028. 2029. 2030. 2031. 2032. 2033. 2034. 2035. 2036. 2037. 2038. 2039. 2040. 2041. 2042. 2043. 2044. 2045. 2046. 2047. 2048. 2049. 2050. 2051. 2052. 2053. 2054. 2055. 2056. 2057. 2058. 2059. 2060. 2061. 2062. 2063. 2064. 2065. 2066. 2067. 2068. 2069. 2070. 2071. 2072. 2073. 2074. 2075. 2076. 2077. 2078. 2079. 2080. 2081. 2082. 2083. 2084. 2085. 2086. 2087. 2088. 2089. 2090. 2091. 2092. 2093. 2094. 2095. 2096. 2097. 2098. 2099. 2100. 2101. 2102. 2103. 2104. 2105. 2106. 2107. 2108. 2109. 2110. 2111. 2112. 2113. 2114. 2115. 2116. 2117. 2118. 2119. 2120. 2121. 2122. 2123. 2124. 2125. 2126. 2127. 2128. 2129. 2130. 2131. 2132. 2133. 2134. 2135. 2136. 2137. 2138. 2139. 2140. 2141. 2142. 2143. 2144. 2145. 2146. 2147. 2148. 2149. 2150. 2151. 2152. 2153. 2154. 2155. 2156. 2157. 2158. 2159. 2160. 2161. 2162. 2163. 2164. 2165. 2166. 2167. 2168. 2169. 2170. 2171. 2172. 2173. 2174. 2175. 2176. 2177. 2178. 2179. 2180. 2181. 2182. 2183. 2184. 2185. 2186. 2187. 2188. 2189. 2190. 2191. 2192. 2193. 2194. 2195. 2196. 2197. 2198. 2199. 2200. 2201. 2202. 2203. 2204. 2205. 2206. 2207. 2208. 2209. 2210. 2211. 2212. 2213. 2214. 2215. 2216. 2217. 2218. 2219. 2220. 2221. 2222. 2223. 2224. 2225. 2226. 2227. 2228. 2229. 2230. 2231. 2232. 2233. 2234. 2235. 2236. 2237. 2238. 2239. 2240. 2241. 2242. 2243. 2244. 2245. 2246. 2247. 2248. 2249. 2250. 2251. 2252. 2253. 2254. 2255. 2256. 2257. 2258. 2259. 2260. 2261. 2262. 2263. 2264. 2265. 2266. 2267. 2268. 2269. 2270. 2271. 2272. 2273. 2274. 2275. 2276. 2277. 2278. 2279. 2280. 2281. 2282. 2283. 2284. 2285. 2286. 2287. 2288. 2289. 2290. 2291. 2292. 2293. 2294. 2295. 2296. 2297. 2298. 2299. 2300. 2301. 2302. 2303. 2304. 2305. 2306. 2307. 2308. 2309. 2310. 2311. 2312. 2313. 2314. 2315. 2316. 2317. 2318. 2319. 2320. 2321. 2322. 2323. 2324. 2325. 2326. 2327. 2328. 2329. 2330. 2331. 2332. 2333. 2334. 2335. 2336. 2337. 2338. 2339. 2340. 2341. 2342. 2343. 2344. 2345. 2346. 2347. 2348. 2349. 2350. 2351. 2352. 2353. 2354. 2355. 2356. 2357. 2358. 2359. 2360. 2361. 2362. 2363. 2364. 2365. 2366. 2367. 2368. 2369. 2370. 2371. 2372. 2373. 2374. 2375. 2376. 2377. 2378. 2379. 2380. 2381. 2382. 2383. 2384. 2385. 2386. 2387. 2388. 2389. 2390. 2391. 2392. 2393. 2394. 2395. 2396. 2397. 2398. 2399. 2400. 2401. 2402. 2403. 2404. 2405. 2406. 2407. 2408. 2409. 2410. 2411. 2412. 2413. 2414. 2415. 2416. 2417. 2418. 2419. 2420. 2421. 2422. 2423. 2424. 2425. 2426. 2427. 2428. 2429. 2430. 2431. 2432. 2433. 2434. 2435. 2436. 2437. 2438. 2439. 2440. 2441. 2442. 2443. 2444. 2445. 2446. 2447. 2448. 2449. 2450. 2451. 2452. 2453. 2454. 2455. 2456. 2457. 2458. 2459. 2460. 2461. 2462. 2463. 2464. 2465. 2466. 2467. 2468. 2469. 2470. 2471. 2472. 2473. 2474. 2475. 2476. 2477. 2478. 2479. 2480. 2481. 2482. 2483. 2484. 2485. 2486. 2487. 2488. 2489. 2490. 2491. 2492. 2493. 2494. 2495. 2496. 2497. 2498. 2499. 2500. 2501. 2502. 2503. 2504. 2505. 2506. 2507. 2508. 2509. 2510. 2511. 2512. 2513. 2514. 2515. 2516. 2517. 2518. 2519. 2520. 2521. 2522. 2523. 2524. 2525. 2526. 2527. 2528. 2529. 2530. 2531. 2532. 2533. 2534. 2535. 2536. 2537. 2538. 2539. 2540. 2541. 2542. 2543. 2544. 2545. 2546. 2547. 2548. 2549. 2550. 2551. 2552. 2553. 2554. 2555. 2556. 2557. 2558. 2559. 2560. 2561. 2562. 2563. 2564. 2565. 2566. 2567. 2568. 2569. 2570. 2571. 2572. 2573. 2574. 2575. 2576. 2577. 2578. 2579. 2580. 2581. 2582. 2583. 2584. 2585. 2586. 2587. 2588. 2589. 2590. 2591. 2592. 2593. 2594. 2595. 2596. 2597. 2598. 2599. 2600. 2601. 2602. 2603. 2604. 2605. 2606. 2607. 2608. 2609. 2610. 2611. 2612. 2613. 2614. 2615. 2616. 2617. 2618. 2619. 2620. 2621. 2622. 2623. 2624. 2625. 2626. 2627. 2628. 2629. 2630. 2631.

Copyright © 2004 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Abstracts of books, articles, and reports are included.

1. $\sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n^2}} = 1 + \frac{1}{2n^2} + \frac{1}{8n^4} + \dots$ (using binomial expansion)

[illegible]

1890-1891

a subsequence $\mathcal{S}^{(3,1-3)}$ of $\mathcal{S}^{(312)}$ such that A_1, A_2, A_3 are its first three sets and for $B = A_1 \cap A_2$, or $A_2 \cap A_3$, or $A_1 \cap A_3$, either

(a)_{3,1-3}: $\epsilon(BA) < 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{S}^{(3,1-3)}$ which follow A_3 ;

or

(b)_{3,1-3}: $\epsilon(BA) \geq 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{S}^{(3,1-3)}$ which follow A_3 .

The alternative which holds depends on B , but again if for example (a)₂ held originally for $B = A_1$, (a)_{3,1-3} must hold for $B = A_1 \cap A_2$ and $B = A_1 \cap A_3$.

Continuing then with this inductive construction one produces finally an infinite sequence $\mathcal{S}^{(3)} \supseteq \mathcal{S}^{(2)}$ such that

$$\underline{\mathcal{S}}^{(2)}(2) \subseteq \underline{\mathcal{S}}^{(3)}(3),$$

and then for each $B \in [\mathcal{S}^{(3)}]$ such that $\rho(B) \leq 2$, either

(a)₃: $\epsilon(BA) < 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{S}^{(3)}$ which follow all the factors of B ;

or

(b)₃: $\epsilon(BA) \geq 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{S}^{(3)}$ which follow all the factors of B .

The first part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the function $f(x)$ defined by the equation $f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n$, where a_n are the coefficients of the power series. It is shown that $f(x)$ is analytic in the disk $|x| < 1$ and that it satisfies the functional equation $f(x) = x f(x^2) + 1$.

In the second part, we consider the problem of the representation of the function $f(x)$ as a sum of two functions, one of which is analytic in the disk $|x| < 1$ and the other is analytic in the disk $|x| < 1/2$.

The third part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the function $f(x)$ defined by the equation $f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n$, where a_n are the coefficients of the power series.

It is shown that $f(x)$ is analytic in the disk $|x| < 1$ and that it satisfies the functional equation $f(x) = x f(x^2) + 1$. It is also shown that $f(x)$ is not analytic in the disk $|x| < 1/2$.

The fourth part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the function $f(x)$ defined by the equation $f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n$, where a_n are the coefficients of the power series.

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n$$

It is shown that $f(x)$ is analytic in the disk $|x| < 1$ and that it satisfies the functional equation $f(x) = x f(x^2) + 1$.

The fifth part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the function $f(x)$ defined by the equation $f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n$, where a_n are the coefficients of the power series.

It is shown that $f(x)$ is analytic in the disk $|x| < 1$ and that it satisfies the functional equation $f(x) = x f(x^2) + 1$.

The sixth part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the function $f(x)$ defined by the equation $f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n$, where a_n are the coefficients of the power series.

Furthermore, if $B = A'A''$, (or A'), (where A'' follows A'), $A', A'' \in \mathcal{J}^{(3)}$, where A' satisfies $(a)_2$, as a B , (or A' satisfies $(a)_1$ as a B) then alternative $(a)_3$ must hold.

Finally then these inductive constructions produce an infinite sequence of subsequences $\mathcal{J}^{(k)}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, such that:

$$(4.23) \quad \mathcal{J}^{(k)} \subset \mathcal{J}^{(k+1)};$$

$$(4.24) \quad \underline{\mathcal{J}}^{(k)}(k) \subset \underline{\mathcal{J}}^{(k+1)}(k+1);$$

and for each $B \in [\mathcal{J}^{(k)}]$ such that $\rho(B) \leq k-1$, either

$(a)_k$: $\epsilon(BA) < 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{J}^{(k)}$ which follow all the factors of B ;

or

$(b)_k$: $\epsilon(BA) \geq 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{J}^{(k)}$ which follow all the factors of B .

Furthermore if $B = B'B''$, $B', B'' \in [\mathcal{J}^{(k)}]$, where $\rho(B) \leq k-1$, all factors of B'' follow all the factors of B' in $\mathcal{J}^{(k)}$, and B' satisfied alternative $(a)_t$ for some $t < k$; then B must satisfy alternative $(a)_k$.

The present study was conducted in the year 1974, in a rural area of the district of ...
The study was carried out in the village of ...
The study was carried out in the village of ...
The study was carried out in the village of ...
The study was carried out in the village of ...

The study was carried out in the village of ...
The study was carried out in the village of ...
The study was carried out in the village of ...
The study was carried out in the village of ...
The study was carried out in the village of ...

The study was carried out in the village of ...
The study was carried out in the village of ...
The study was carried out in the village of ...
The study was carried out in the village of ...
The study was carried out in the village of ...

The study was carried out in the village of ...
The study was carried out in the village of ...
The study was carried out in the village of ...
The study was carried out in the village of ...
The study was carried out in the village of ...

The study was carried out in the village of ...
The study was carried out in the village of ...
The study was carried out in the village of ...
The study was carried out in the village of ...
The study was carried out in the village of ...

From the above it follows readily that

$$\mathcal{S}' = \lim \mathcal{S}^{(k)}(k),$$

is an infinite subsequence of \mathcal{S}^* possessing the properties quoted in the lemma.

Remarks

It follows from Lemma 4.3 that if the sequence \mathcal{S}^* contains infinitely many A such that $\varepsilon(A) < 0$, then there is an infinite subsequence $\mathcal{S}' \subset \mathcal{S}^*$ such that for all $B \in [\mathcal{S}']$,

$$(4.25) \quad \varepsilon(B) < 0.$$

It is not clear that this conclusion may also be asserted if we assume only that the original sequence \mathcal{S} (with $\Delta(\mathcal{S}) > 0$) contains infinitely many A such that

$$\varepsilon(A|\mathcal{S}) < 0,$$

and possibly this is false.

In any event, if $\varepsilon(A) < 0$ infinitely often in \mathcal{S}^* , (4.25), together with (4.8), and (4.9), yields Theorem 4.2A immediately. Hence, in the following we need only consider the alternative wherein $\varepsilon(A) \geq 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{S}^*$. By a further subsequence extraction we can arrange that either

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PHYSICS DEPARTMENT

TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
PHYSICS DEPARTMENT
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
JANUARY 1, 1900

DEAR SIR:

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 27th inst. and in reply to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration.

Very respectfully,
J. H. P. [Signature]

JOHN H. P. [Signature]

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PHYSICS DEPARTMENT

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

JANUARY 1, 1900

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

(i) $\varepsilon(A) = 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}'$ (\mathcal{A}' an infinite sequence);

or

(ii) $\varepsilon(A) > 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}'$ (\mathcal{A}' an infinite sequence).

under case (ii), we have from (4.12) that

$$\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}'} \varepsilon(A) < \infty.$$

The following lemmas will provide, in particular, that alternative (ii) is impossible.

Lemma 4.4 Let \mathcal{A}' be the infinite sequence of Lemma 4.3, and assume $\varepsilon(A) \geq 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}'$. Let $\chi(\omega|A)$ denote the characteristic function of the set A ; and let \mathcal{F} denote the set of fifth powers of the positive integers. Furthermore, if $\mathcal{A}' = \{A_1, A_2, \dots\}$, let M be the set of ω such that

$$(4.26) \quad \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \chi(\omega|A_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n P(A_i) \right| \geq n^{5/8}$$

for infinitely many $n \in \mathcal{F}$. Then

$$(4.27) \quad P(M) = 0.$$

Proof: we have

... ..

... ..

... ..

$$\dots$$

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

$$\dots$$

... ..

... ..

... ..

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \chi(\omega | A_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n P(A_i) \right)^2 dP \\
&= \sum_{i,j \leq n} P(A_i A_j) - \sum_{i,j \leq n} P(A_i) P(A_j) \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} \left(-\epsilon(A_i) + O\left(\frac{1}{j^3}\right) \right) P(A_i) P(A_j) + O(n) \\
&\leq O(n) .
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, if M_n denotes the set of ω such that (4.26) holds, this implies

$$(4.27) \quad P(M_n) = O\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/4}}\right) .$$

(4.27) in turn implies that

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} P(M_n) < \infty ,$$

so that by the Borel-Cantelli lemma, $M = \{M_n \text{ i.o.}, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ has probability zero, and the lemma is proved.

Lemma 4.5 Let \mathcal{E}' be the infinite sequence as described in Lemma 4.4. Let $B \in [\mathcal{E}']$, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n f\left(\frac{k}{n}\right) = \int_0^1 f(x) dx$$

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{x^2} \quad \text{for } x \in [1, \infty)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k^2} = \int_1^{\infty} \frac{1}{x^2} dx$$

$$= 1$$

Consider the function $f(x) = \frac{1}{x^2}$ on the interval $[1, \infty)$. The function is continuous and decreasing on this interval. We can use the integral test to determine the convergence of the series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^2}$.

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^2} = \int_1^{\infty} \frac{1}{x^2} dx \quad (1.1)$$

The integral test states that if $f(x)$ is a positive, continuous, and decreasing function on the interval $[1, \infty)$, then the series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f(k)$ converges if and only if the improper integral $\int_1^{\infty} f(x) dx$ converges.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k^2} = \int_1^{\infty} \frac{1}{x^2} dx$$

Since $f(x) = \frac{1}{x^2}$ is a positive, continuous, and decreasing function on the interval $[1, \infty)$, we can apply the integral test. The integral $\int_1^{\infty} \frac{1}{x^2} dx$ converges to 1, so the series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^2}$ also converges to 1.

Another way to see this is by using the formula for the sum of a geometric series. The series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^2}$ can be written as $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{k}\right)^2$. This is a special case of the more general series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^p}$, which converges for $p > 1$.

$$(4.28) \quad \lim_{n \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{\sum_{i \leq n} P(BA_i)}{\sum_{i \leq n} P(A_i)} \geq P(B).$$

Proof: Applying Fatou's lemma, we have

$$(4.29) \quad \lim_{n \in \mathcal{A}} \int_B \frac{\sum_{i \leq n} \chi(\omega | A_i)}{\sum_{i \leq n} P(A_i)} dP \geq \lim_{n \in \mathcal{A}} \int_{B \cap M} \frac{\sum_{i \leq n} \chi(\omega | A_i)}{\sum_{i \leq n} P(A_i)} dP$$

$$\geq \int_{B \cap \bar{M}} \lim_{n \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{\sum_{i \leq n} \chi(\omega | A_i)}{\sum_{i \leq n} P(A_i)} dP.$$

Clearly,

$$(4.30) \quad \int_B \frac{\sum_{i \leq n} \chi(\omega | A_i)}{\sum_{i \leq n} P(A_i)} dP = \frac{\sum_{i \leq n} P(BA_i)}{\sum_{i \leq n} P(A_i)}.$$

$$f(x) = \frac{(x^2 - 1)^n}{(x^2 + 1)^{n+1}} \quad (1)$$

Let us find the derivative of (1)

$$f'(x) = \frac{(x^2 - 1)^n}{(x^2 + 1)^{n+1}} \cdot \frac{2x}{1} - \frac{(x^2 - 1)^n}{(x^2 + 1)^{n+1}} \cdot \frac{2x}{1} = 0$$

or

$$\frac{(x^2 - 1)^n}{(x^2 + 1)^{n+1}} = 0$$

or

$$\frac{(x^2 - 1)^n}{(x^2 + 1)^{n+1}} = 0$$

or

Also, by Lemma 4.4, on \overline{M} (the complement of M)

$$\lim_{n \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{\sum_{i \geq n} \chi(\omega | A_i)}{\sum_{i \leq n} P(A_i)} = 1,$$

so that

$$(4.31) \quad \int_{B \cap \overline{M}} \lim_{n \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{\sum_{i \leq n} \chi(\omega | A_i)}{\sum_{i \leq n} P(A_i)} = P(B \cap \overline{M}) = P(B),$$

since $P(\overline{M}) = 1$. From (4.29), (4.30), and (4.31), (4.28) follows.

Lemma 4.6. Set \mathcal{A}' be the infinite sequence as described in Lemma 4.4. Let $B \in [\mathcal{A}']$, then

$$(4.32) \quad \epsilon(B) \leq 0.$$

Thus as a consequence of (4.8) and (4.9),

$$(4.33) \quad P_B(A) \geq \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{[r(A | \mathcal{A}')]^3} \right\} P(A).$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{A}'$ such that A follows all factors of B in \mathcal{A}' .

Proof: Suppose that for a given $B \in [\mathcal{A}']$, the A_i with $1 \leq i \leq k = k(B)$, occur in \mathcal{A}' after all the factors of B . Since

Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{x^2}$ and $g(x) = \frac{1}{x}$. Then $f(x)g(x) = \frac{1}{x^3}$.

$$\frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{1}{x^3} \right) = -\frac{3}{x^4} = -\frac{3}{x^4} \cdot \frac{1}{x^3} = -\frac{3}{x^7}.$$

or

$$\frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{1}{x^3} \right) = -\frac{3}{x^4} = -\frac{3}{x^4} \cdot \frac{1}{x^3} = -\frac{3}{x^7}. \quad (11.1)$$

Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{x^2}$ and $g(x) = \frac{1}{x}$. Then $f(x)g(x) = \frac{1}{x^3}$.

or

Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{x^2}$ and $g(x) = \frac{1}{x}$. Then $f(x)g(x) = \frac{1}{x^3}$.

$$\frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{1}{x^3} \right) = -\frac{3}{x^4} = -\frac{3}{x^4} \cdot \frac{1}{x^3} = -\frac{3}{x^7}.$$

Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{x^2}$ and $g(x) = \frac{1}{x}$. Then $f(x)g(x) = \frac{1}{x^3}$.

$$\frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{1}{x^3} \right) = -\frac{3}{x^4} = -\frac{3}{x^4} \cdot \frac{1}{x^3} = -\frac{3}{x^7}. \quad (11.2)$$

Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{x^2}$ and $g(x) = \frac{1}{x}$. Then $f(x)g(x) = \frac{1}{x^3}$.

Let $f(x) = \frac{1}{x^2}$ and $g(x) = \frac{1}{x}$. Then $f(x)g(x) = \frac{1}{x^3}$.

$$\lim_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{\sum_{k \leq i \leq n} P(BA_1)}{\sum_{k \leq i \leq n} P(A_1)} = \lim_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{\sum_{i \leq n} P(BA_1)}{\sum_{i \leq n} P(A_1)}$$

we obtain from (4.28) that

$$(4.34) \quad \lim_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{\sum_{k \leq i \leq n} P(BA_1)}{\sum_{k \leq i \leq n} P(A_1)} \geq P(B).$$

On the other hand, from (4.8) and (4.9),

$$\sum_{k \leq i \leq n} P(BA_1) \leq \sum_{k \leq i \leq n} P(B)P(A_1) (1 - \varepsilon(B)) + O\left(\frac{1}{i^3}\right),$$

which together with (4.34) yields (4.32).

Finally, the assertion (4.33) of the above lemma, taken together with the second remark which follows the statement of Theorem 4.2A, completes the proof of Theorem 4.2A.

A bit more may be extracted from the above arguments. if in the proof of Lemma 4.5 the Lebesgue convergence Theorem is applied instead of Fatou's lemma, one obtains

$$(4.35) \quad \lim_{\substack{n \rightarrow \infty \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} \frac{\sum_{i \leq n} P(BA_1)}{\sum_{i \leq n} P(A_1)} = P(B).$$

Then, as in the proof of Lemma 4.6, this leads to

1. The first part of the document is a letter from the President of the United States to the Congress, dated January 1, 1861. It is a formal address, and it begins with the words "My Countrymen," and "I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th inst., and in reply to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration."

[Faint handwritten notes at the bottom of the page]

$$f(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{z}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{z} + c, \quad \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \quad \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad c \in \mathbb{R}.$$

$$(4.36) \quad \epsilon(B) = 0,$$

for all $B \in [\mathcal{S}']$. This result, which is obtained in the case where $\epsilon(A) = 0$ in \mathcal{S}' , may then be combined with Lemma 4.3 to give

Theorem 4.2B. Given an infinite sequence \mathcal{S} , with $\Delta(\mathcal{S}) > 0$, either (I) there exists an infinite subsequence $\mathcal{S}'' \subset \mathcal{S}$ such that

$$(4.37) \quad \epsilon(B) < 0,$$

for all $B \in [\mathcal{S}'']$; or

(II) there exists an infinite subsequence $\mathcal{S}' \subset \mathcal{S}$ such that

$$(4.38) \quad \epsilon(B) = 0,$$

for all $B \in [\mathcal{S}']$.

§5. One More Counterexample. The form of the assertion (4.2A) suggests the conjecture that there must exist a subsequence of \mathcal{S} ($\Delta(\mathcal{S}) > 0$) on which (4.1A) may be strengthened to

1900

1900

and in the year 1900, the total number of
persons in the United States was 76,000,000.
The population of the United States in 1900
was 76,000,000. The population of the United States
in 1900 was 76,000,000. The population of the United States
in 1900 was 76,000,000.

1900

1900

The population of the United States in 1900
was 76,000,000. The population of the United States
in 1900 was 76,000,000. The population of the United States
in 1900 was 76,000,000.

1900

1900

The population of the United States in 1900
was 76,000,000. The population of the United States
in 1900 was 76,000,000. The population of the United States
in 1900 was 76,000,000. The population of the United States
in 1900 was 76,000,000.

$$(5.1) \quad P\left(\bigcap_{\mu=1}^k A_{i_\mu}\right) \geq \left(1 - \phi(k)\right) \prod_{\mu=1}^k P(A_{i_\mu})$$

where $\phi(k) > 0$, is some function such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \phi(k) = 0$.

we will now show that this conjecture is not true.

Note first that if \mathcal{A}' is the subsequence of \mathcal{A} on which (5.1) holds, (5.1) also holds relative to any subsequence of \mathcal{A}' . We then choose the subsequence \mathcal{A}'' , provided by Theorem 4.2B, on which one of the alternatives (I) or (II) must hold. If for $A_i, A_j \in \mathcal{A}''$, $i \neq j$,

$$(5.2) \quad P(A_i A_j) < P(A_i)P(A_j),$$

then it is alternative (II) which must hold. Assume this to be the case. Then it follows that for any fixed A_{i_1}, A_{i_2} in \mathcal{A}'' , we may choose

$$A_{i_3}(k) \cdots A_{i_k}(k) \in \mathcal{A}'',$$

so that $i_v(k) \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ in such a way as to provide

$$(5.3) \quad P(A_{i_1} A_{i_2} A_{i_3}(k) \cdots A_{i_k}(k)) \\ \sim \left(1 + E(A_{i_1}, A_{i_2})\right) P(A_{i_1})P(A_{i_2}) \prod_{\mu=3}^k P(A_{i_\mu}(k)).$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{f(x)g(y)}{|x-y|^\alpha} dx dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{f(x)g(y)}{|x-y|^\alpha} dy dx \quad (1.1)$$

Let f, g be functions on \mathbb{R}^n such that $f, g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then the above integral is well defined and the order of integration can be interchanged. This is a consequence of Fubini's theorem.

Another way to see this is to note that the integral is symmetric in f and g . If we interchange f and g , the integral remains the same. This is because the integrand is symmetric in x and y . Therefore, the order of integration can be interchanged.

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{f(x)g(y)}{|x-y|^\alpha} dx dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{f(y)g(x)}{|y-x|^\alpha} dy dx \quad (1.2)$$

Let f, g be functions on \mathbb{R}^n such that $f, g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then the above integral is well defined and the order of integration can be interchanged. This is a consequence of Fubini's theorem.

$$f(x)g(y) = g(y)f(x)$$

Let f, g be functions on \mathbb{R}^n such that $f, g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then the above integral is well defined and the order of integration can be interchanged. This is a consequence of Fubini's theorem.

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{f(x)g(y)}{|x-y|^\alpha} dx dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{f(y)g(x)}{|y-x|^\alpha} dy dx \quad (1.3)$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{f(x)g(y)}{|x-y|^\alpha} dx dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{f(y)g(x)}{|y-x|^\alpha} dy dx$$

But then (5.1) and (5.3) imply that

$$1 + E \left(A_{i_1}, A_{i_2} \right) \geq 1 - \phi(k) + o(1)$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$, which in turn implies

$$E \left(A_{i_1}, A_{i_2} \right) \geq 0.$$

This, however, implies that

$$P(A_{i_1} \cap A_{i_2}) \geq P(A_{i_1})P(A_{i_2})$$

in contradiction to (5.2).

Thus (5.1) is impossible if (5.2) holds, and the proposed conjecture is proved false once we produce a sequence on which (5.2) holds. We construct such a sequence, inductively, as follows. Let A_1 be any set such that $P(A_1)$ is greater than $3/4$; i.e. $P(A_1) = 1 - \epsilon_1$, $\epsilon_1 < 1/4$, and $P(A_1) < 1$, i.e. $\epsilon_1 > 0$. Assume then that the A_j , $j < n$ have been constructed with $P(A_j) = 1 - \epsilon_j$, $0 < \epsilon_j \leq \frac{1}{2^{j+1}}$.

Since

$$\begin{aligned} P \left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{n-1} A_j \right) &= 1 - P \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{n-1} \bar{A}_j \right) \\ &\geq 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \epsilon_j > 0, \end{aligned}$$

1870 1871 1872 1873 1874 1875 1876 1877 1878 1879 1880 1881 1882 1883 1884 1885 1886 1887 1888 1889 1890 1891 1892 1893 1894 1895 1896 1897 1898 1899 1900 1901 1902 1903 1904 1905 1906 1907 1908 1909 1910 1911 1912 1913 1914 1915 1916 1917 1918 1919 1920 1921 1922 1923 1924 1925 1926 1927 1928 1929 1930 1931 1932 1933 1934 1935 1936 1937 1938 1939 1940 1941 1942 1943 1944 1945 1946 1947 1948 1949 1950 1951 1952 1953 1954 1955 1956 1957 1958 1959 1960 1961 1962 1963 1964 1965 1966 1967 1968 1969 1970 1971 1972 1973 1974 1975 1976 1977 1978 1979 1980 1981 1982 1983 1984 1985 1986 1987 1988 1989 1990 1991 1992 1993 1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 2025 2026 2027 2028 2029 2030 2031 2032 2033 2034 2035 2036 2037 2038 2039 2040 2041 2042 2043 2044 2045 2046 2047 2048 2049 2050 2051 2052 2053 2054 2055 2056 2057 2058 2059 2060 2061 2062 2063 2064 2065 2066 2067 2068 2069 2070 2071 2072 2073 2074 2075 2076 2077 2078 2079 2080 2081 2082 2083 2084 2085 2086 2087 2088 2089 2090 2091 2092 2093 2094 2095 2096 2097 2098 2099 2100 2101 2102 2103 2104 2105 2106 2107 2108 2109 2110 2111 2112 2113 2114 2115 2116 2117 2118 2119 2120 2121 2122 2123 2124 2125 2126 2127 2128 2129 2130 2131 2132 2133 2134 2135 2136 2137 2138 2139 2140 2141 2142 2143 2144 2145 2146 2147 2148 2149 2150 2151 2152 2153 2154 2155 2156 2157 2158 2159 2160 2161 2162 2163 2164 2165 2166 2167 2168 2169 2170 2171 2172 2173 2174 2175 2176 2177 2178 2179 2180 2181 2182 2183 2184 2185 2186 2187 2188 2189 2190 2191 2192 2193 2194 2195 2196 2197 2198 2199 2200 2201 2202 2203 2204 2205 2206 2207 2208 2209 2210 2211 2212 2213 2214 2215 2216 2217 2218 2219 2220 2221 2222 2223 2224 2225 2226 2227 2228 2229 2230 2231 2232 2233 2234 2235 2236 2237 2238 2239 2240 2241 2242 2243 2244 2245 2246 2247 2248 2249 2250 2251 2252 2253 2254 2255 2256 2257 2258 2259 2260 2261 2262 2263 2264 2265 2266 2267 2268 2269 2270 2271 2272 2273 2274 2275 2276 2277 2278 2279 2280 2281 2282 2283 2284 2285 2286 2287 2288 2289 2290 2291 2292 2293 2294 2295 2296 2297 2298 2299 2300 2301 2302 2303 2304 2305 2306 2307 2308 2309 2310 2311 2312 2313 2314 2315 2316 2317 2318 2319 2320 2321 2322 2323 2324 2325 2326 2327 2328 2329 2330 2331 2332 2333 2334 2335 2336 2337 2338 2339 2340 2341 2342 2343 2344 2345 2346 2347 2348 2349 2350 2351 2352 2353 2354 2355 2356 2357 2358 2359 2360 2361 2362 2363 2364 2365 2366 2367 2368 2369 2370 2371 2372 2373 2374 2375 2376 2377 2378 2379 2380 2381 2382 2383 2384 2385 2386 2387 2388 2389 2390 2391 2392 2393 2394 2395 2396 2397 2398 2399 2400 2401 2402 2403 2404 2405 2406 2407 2408 2409 2410 2411 2412 2413 2414 2415 2416 2417 2418 2419 2420 2421 2422 2423 2424 2425 2426 2427 2428 2429 2430 2431 2432 2433 2434 2435 2436 2437 2438 2439 2440 2441 2442 2443 2444 2445 2446 2447 2448 2449 2450 2451 2452 2453 2454 2455 2456 2457 2458 2459 2460 2461 2462 2463 2464 2465 2466 2467 2468 2469 2470 2471 2472 2473 2474 2475 2476 2477 2478 2479 2480 2481 2482 2483 2484 2485 2486 2487 2488 2489 2490 2491 2492 2493 2494 2495 2496 2497 2498 2499 2500 2501 2502 2503 2504 2505 2506 2507 2508 2509 2510 2511 2512 2513 2514 2515 2516 2517 2518 2519 2520 2521 2522 2523 2524 2525 2526 2527 2528 2529 2530 2531 2532 2533 2534 2535 2536 2537 2538 2539 2540 2541 2542 2543 2544 2545 2546 2547 2548 2549 2550 2551 2552 2553 2554 2555 2556 2557 2558 2559 2560 2561 2562 2563 2564 2565 2566 2567 2568 2569 2570 2571 2572 2573 2574 2575 2576 2577 2578 2579 2580 2581 2582 2583 2584 2585 2586 2587 2588 2589 2590 2591 2592 2593 2594 2595 2596 2597 2598 2599 2600 2601 2602 2603 2604 2605 2606 2607 2608 2609 2610 2611 2612 2613 2614 2615 2616 2617 2618 2619 2620 2621 2622 2623 2624 2625 2626 2627 2628 2629 2630 2631 2632 2633 2634 2635 2636 2637 2638 2639 2640 2641 2642 2643 2644 2645 2646 2647 2648 2649 2650 2651 2652 2653 2654 2655 2656 2657 2658 2659 2660 2661 2662 2663 2664 2665 2666 2667 2668 2669 2670 2671 2672 2673 2674 2675 2676 2677 2678 2679 2680 2681 2682 2683 2684 2685 2686 2687 2688

$\Delta H_{\text{cal}} = \Delta H_{\text{cal}}^{\text{cal}} - \Delta H_{\text{cal}}^{\text{cal}} = 0$

... ..

1. 1944

100-0-1-2-13-0

1. The first part of the document is a list of names and titles, including "The Hon. Mr. Justice" and "The Hon. Mr. Justice".

70. The following table shows the number of persons in the United States who were employed in the various occupations in 1900 and 1910.

[Faint handwritten notes at the bottom of the page]

Figure 1. Schematic diagram of the experimental setup. The laser beam is focused on the sample, and the scattered light is collected by the objective lens and detected by the photodetector.

We can choose for A_n any set such that

$$P(A_n) = 1 - \epsilon_n, \quad \overline{A_n} \subset \bigcap_{j=1}^{n-1} A_j ;$$

and where

$$0 < \epsilon_n \leq \min \left(\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}, P \left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{n-1} A_j \right) \right) .$$

Then for $1 \leq j < n$, we have

$$P(A_j A_n) = P(A_j) - P(A_j \overline{A_n}) = P(A_j) - \epsilon_n$$

and

$$P(A_j)P(A_n) = (1 - \epsilon_n)P(A_j) .$$

Since

$$(1 - \epsilon_n)P(A_j) > P(A_j) - \epsilon_n ,$$

it follows that

$$P(A_j A_n) < P(A_j)P(A_n) .$$

Thus the inductive nature of the construction is established, and we obtain a sequence such that (5.2) holds.

Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space and \mathcal{H}^* its dual space.

$$\mathcal{H} \cong \mathcal{H}^* \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \mathcal{H} \text{ is reflexive.}$$

Proof:

$$\mathcal{H} \cong \mathcal{H}^* \iff \exists T: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^* \text{ bijective linear map.}$$

Let $T: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^*$ be a linear map.

$$T(x)(y) = \langle x, y \rangle \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Then

$$T(x) = 0 \iff x = 0.$$

Conversely

$$T(x) = 0 \implies x = 0.$$

Let $x \in \mathcal{H}$ and $y \in \mathcal{H}$.

$$\langle T(x), y \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle.$$

Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space and \mathcal{H}^* its dual space. Let $T: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^*$ be a linear map.

Let $x \in \mathcal{H}$ and $y \in \mathcal{H}$. Then $\langle T(x), y \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle$.

BASIC DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR UNCLASSIFIED TECHNICAL REPORTS

| <u>Address</u> | <u>No. of
Copies</u> | <u>Address</u> | <u>No. of
Copies</u> |
|---|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| Head, Statistics Branch
Office of Naval Research
Washington 25, D. C. | 3 | Prof. I. R. Savage
School of Business Admin.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota | 1 |
| Commanding Officer
Office of Naval Research
Branch Office, Navy 100
Fleet Post Office
New York, New York | 2 | Prof. Oscar Kempthorne
Statistics Laboratory
Iowa State College
Ames, Iowa | 1 |
| ASTIA Document Service Cntr.
Arlington Hall Sta.
Arlington 12, Virginia | 5 | Dr. Carl F. Kossack
Statistics Laboratory
Engineering Admin. Building
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana | 1 |
| Office of Techn. Services
Department of Commerce
Washington 25, D. C. | 1 | Prof. Gerald J. Lieberman
Appl. Math. & Stat. Lab.
Stanford University
Stanford, California | 1 |
| Techn. Informa. Officer
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington 25, D. C. | 6 | Prof. William G. Madow
Department of Statistics
Stanford University
Stanford, California | 1 |
| Prof. T. W. Anderson
Dept. of Math. Statistics
Columbia University
New York 27, New York | 1 | Prof. J. Neyman
Department of Statistics
University of California
Berkeley 4, California | 1 |
| Prof. Z. W. Birnbaum
Lab. of Stat. Research
Dept. of Mathematics
University of Washington
Seattle 5, Washington | 1 | Prof. Herbert Robbins
Math. Statistics Department
Columbia University
New York 27, New York | 1 |
| Prof. Ralph A. Bradley
Dept. of Stat. & Stat. Lab.
Virginia Polytechnic Inst.
Blacksburg, Virginia | 1 | Prof. Murray Rosenblatt
Dept. of Mathematics
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana | 1 |
| Prof. Herman Chernoff
Appl. Math. & Stat. Lab.
Stanford University
Stanford, California | 1 | Prof. L. J. Savage
Statistical Res. Laboratory
Chicago University
Chicago 37, Illinois | 1 |
| Prof. W. G. Cochran
Dept. of Statistics
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts | 1 | Prof. Frank Spitzer
Dept. of Mathematics
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota | 1 |
| Prof. Benjamin Epstein
Appl. Math. & Stat. Lab.
Stanford University
Stanford, California | 1 | Prof. S. S. Wilks
Dept. of Mathematics
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey | 1 |
| Prof. Harold Hotelling
Associate Director
Institute of Statistics
Univ. of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina | 1 | | |

BASIC DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR UNCLASSIFIED TECHNICAL REPORTS (cont.)

| <u>Address</u> | <u>No. of
copies</u> |
|---|--------------------------|
| Prof. Gertrude Cox
Institute of Statistics
State College Section
North Carolina State College
Raleigh, North Carolina | 1 |
| Prof. J. Wolfowitz
Department of Mathematics
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York | 1 |

Date Due

[illegible]

NYU
IMM-
253 Shapiro, H. N.
c. 1 Extensions of the Khinchine-
Wisser theorem.

NYU
IMM-
253 Shapiro, H. N.
AUTHOR
c. 1
Extensions of the Khinchine-
Wisser
theorem.

| DATE DUE | BORROWER'S NAME | ROOM
NUMBER |
|----------|-------------------------|----------------|
| MAR 2 66 | Paul Magriel | |
| AUG 7 | Paul Magriel | |
| | S. Parris | |

N. Y. U. Institute of
Mathematical Sciences
25 Waverly Place
New York 3, N. Y.

